



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE JEWS OF ENGLAND UNDER
THE ANGEVIN KINGS.¹

No other country possesses such rich historical materials for the early middle ages as England. The early centralisation of the Government, and the comparative absence of civil war account for this. It is not surprising, therefore, that the history of the Jews in England during the twelfth century is much more full than that of the Jews of France, Germany, Italy, or Spain, which did not practically exist as historic entities at so early a period. The English records are not only remarkably rich, but they enable us to see the rise of the peculiar position of the Jews, whereas, in other countries, the mists first dissolve when the status of the Jews had been definitely and permanently degraded by the action of Innocent III. In England, on the other hand, we start with comparative equality, and the more rigid restrictions of the thirteenth century are not to be found, or only in slight measure, till the reign of John, and are not, therefore, to be found in the following notes. It was the Church, and the Church alone, that produced the peculiar position of the Jews in Angevin England.

THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS.—The position of the Jews in mediæval Europe, and therefore in Angevin England, was entirely determined by the attitude of the Church towards them. State and Church were one, and none could belong to the State who did not belong to the State Church. The Jews, as the arch-heretics, the natural enemies of the Church, the Anti-Christ incarnate, were regarded as naturally incapable of forming part of a com-

¹ Up to 1206 ; I adopt this *terminus ad quem* with Miss Norgate in her *England under the Angevin Kings*. The loss of Normandy in 1206 was even more eventful for English Jews than for Englishmen in general.

munity which was a Christian brotherhood as well as a political organisation.

The means adopted by the Church to ensure the sacrosanctity of the body politic was to connect every public office with religious ceremonials of some kind or another. No office could be entered upon without an oath, and the simplest form of initiative ceremony involved the formula, "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti," which no Jew could accept and remain a Jew.¹ In this way every part of the national life was at least formally Christianised. Even such a simple thing as taking a farm involved, in feudal England, paying homage, which was again connected with the religious formula. Besides this, the whole economic life of England was bound up with the institution of guilds, and these were as much religious confraternities as trade unions. Owing to the close connection of the Church with the national life, the Jew could find no career in agriculture, trade, public or municipal office.

At the same time the Church had some reason to fear a rival, or at least a disturbing element, in the Jew. After all, the Christianity of early England was but a thin veneer over a thick crust of underlying paganism, much of which still survives in the form of folk-lore. The position of the Jews was crucial to her claims. As she had to recognise them as the people of God, their non-acceptance of her claims was doubly damaging. Hence the eagerness with which she urged their conversion; hence, too, the increasing bitterness with which she regarded them as her attempts at conversion failed. There is a marked increase of acrimony between the controversy of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster, with R. Simeon Chasid, from Treves, at the beginning of the twelfth century, and the treatise of Peter of Blois, *Against the Perfidy of the Jews*, at the end of the century. This may have been accentuated by the public derision

¹ A survival still exists in the reception ceremony of Bachelors of Art at Oxford and Cambridge. I had to apply for special permission to have the words omitted on taking my degree at Cambridge.

cast by the Jews on the more assailable sides of Catholicism—the worship of images and the creation of miracles. The Jews of England were painfully interested in miracle-mongering, as the myth of the “blood-accusation”—the alleged murder of Christian children at Passover for ritual purposes—first arose in England in connection with the case of William of Norwich, boy and martyr, 1144, and was undoubtedly encouraged by the Church, as it brought more custom to the shrines involved. Besides all this, there are signs that Judaism had begun to attract converts in England, and thus threatened to be a rival. Altogether, the Church made its anti-Jewish enactments more oppressive towards the end of the twelfth century in England, and especially attempted to keep the Jews more isolated from their fellow-citizens, and to drive them out of every department of public life.

THE CHURCH AND USURY.—There was, however, one sphere of activity which the Church left open to the Jew by closing it to the Christian. To a certain extent she made practicable the socialism of the early Church. Through misinterpretation of Luke vi. 35, translated by the Vulgate, “Mutuum date, n’hil inde sperantes” (but really meaning, “Lend, never despairing,” R.V.), all addition on the repayment of a loan was regarded as strictly forbidden. It was also interpreted to mean (by St. Augustine, or Pope Julius, for example), that no addition was to be expected on the price of goods bought. In other words, the Church declared against capitalism of any kind, branding it as usury. It became impossible in Angevin England to obtain the capital for any large scheme of building or organisation unless the projectors had the capital themselves.

Here was the function which the Jew could perform in the England of the twelfth century, which was just passing economically out of the stage of barter. Capital was wanted in particular for the change of architecture from wood to stone with the better classes, and especially for the

erection of castles and monasteries. The Jews were indeed the first in England to possess dwelling-houses built with stone, probably for purposes of protection as well as of comfort. And as a specimen of their influence on monastic architecture, we have it on record that no less than nine Cistercian monasteries of the North Country were built by money lent by the great Aaron of Lincoln, who also boasted that he had built the shrine of St. Alban. It was chiefly, then, the smaller barons and the monasteries that needed the capital of the Jews, and it is characteristic enough that their chief persecutors came from precisely these two classes.

The Church prohibition of "usury" would have been ineffective if the State had not followed suit. If the usurer had merely to fear the spiritual terrors of the Church the practice might not have been very greatly checked. But the State followed suit by confiscating the chattels of a usurer who died in his sin, and applied the provision quite impartially to Jew or Christian. This provision brought about a curious result when there came to exist a class of men like the Jews of Angevin England, whose whole function was to be usurers or capitalists. The State as represented by the king became the universal legatee of the whole Jewry, and he was thus brought into immediate connection, a sort of sleeping partnership, with Jewish usury.

THE KING AND THE JEWS.—The result of the Church's attitude towards Jews and towards usury was to put the king into a peculiar relation towards his Jewish subjects. The Church kept them out of all other pursuits but that of usury, which it branded as infamous; the State followed suit, and confiscated the estates of all usurers dying as such. Hence, as a Jew could only be a usurer, his estate was always potentially the king's, and could be dealt with by the king as if it were his own. Yet, strange to say, it was not to the king's interest to keep the Jew's wealth in his own hands for he, the king, as a good Christian,

could not get usury for it, while the Jew could very soon double and treble it, since the absence of competition enabled him to fix the rate of interest very high, rarely less than forty per cent., often as much as eighty. As the Jew might die before the debt was due and the king be then content to take a much smaller sum as a composition for the debt, it was often the debtor's interest to keep the debt standing. The usury was in the nature of a bet against the Jew's life. The only useful function the Jew could perform towards both king and people was to be as rich as possible, just as the larger the capital of a bank, the more valuable the part it plays in the world of commerce. No wonder the expression "rich as a Jew" passed into a proverb; as applied to the English Jew of the twelfth century, it was as tautologous as saying, "rich as a bank."

The king reaped the benefit of these riches in several ways. One of his main functions and main sources of income was selling justice, and Jews were among his best customers. Then he claimed from them, as from his other subjects, fines and amerciements for all the events of life. The Pipe Rolls contain entries of fines paid by Jews to marry, not to marry, to become divorced, to go a journey across the sea, to become partners with another Jew,¹ in short, for all the decisive events of life. And above all, the king got frequent windfalls from the heirs of deceased Jews who paid heavy reliefs to have their fathers' charters and debts, of which, as we have seen, they could make more profitable use than the king, to whom the Jew's property escheated not *quâ* Jew, but *quâ* usurer. In the case of the great Aaron of Lincoln the king did not disgorge at all, but kept in his own hands the great treasures, lands, houses and debts of the great financier who appears to have first organised the Jewry, and made the whole of the English Jews his

¹ There was a special reason why the king claimed compensation for a partnership between two Jews. Debts to the firm would not fall into his hand when one of the partners died.

agents throughout the country. Aaron's treasures were lost at sea, but his debts amounted to some £15,000, equal to half the king's income, and required a special branch of the Exchequer, the *Scaccarium Aaronis*, with two treasurers and two clerks to look after them, for many years to come.

This great windfall, which occurred in 1187, must have opened the eyes of the king's officials to the profitable source of income that lay in Jewish usury; three years later they learned the dangers to which this source was liable. The *émeutes* of 1189-90, culminating in the York massacre, had as one of their objects the destruction of the deeds and charters of the Jews; in York they were burnt in the Minster. The loss thus sustained by the king led to the organisation of the Jewry in 1194, when the "Ordinances of the Jewry" were promulgated; these provided for a full record of all Jewish business to be kept in the king's hands, so, that he might know exactly how much each Jew was worth, and how much he could extract from him. The Exchequer of the Jews of the thirteenth century, with its Star Chamber devoted to the *Shetars* of the Hebrew usuries, grew out of the "Ordinances of the Jewry," but lies beyond the limits of our present purview.¹

In addition to these quasi-regular and normal sources of income from his Jews, the king claimed from them—again as from his other subjects—various contributions from time to time under the names of gifts and tallages. And here he certainly seems, on occasion at least, to have exercised an unfavourable discrimination in his demands from the Jews. In 1187, the year of Aaron of Lincoln's death, he took a tenth from the rest of England, which yielded £70,000, and a quarter from the Jews, which gave as much as £60,000. In other words, the Jews were reckoned to have, at that date, one quarter of the movable

¹ See the excellent paper of Dr. C. Gross on the subject in *Papers Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 1888.

wealth of the kingdom (£240,000 against £700,000 held by the rest).

Altogether, in these various ways, I reckon that the English kings in the latter half of the twelfth century drew on an average, a sum of £3,000 per annum from their Jews. As his whole income did not reach much more than £35,000, the Jews contributed one-twelfth of his resources. It was somewhat as if they contributed £7,000,000 to the Budget now-a-days. They acted the part of a sponge for the Royal Treasury, they gathered up all the floating money of the country, to be squeezed from time to time into the king's treasure-chest. I fancy that at one time in Henry II.'s reign, it was contemplated making them the king's tax-gathers, as they were in Spain and elsewhere. I find several items in the early Pipe Rolls of that monarch which show that the sheriffs of the counties were directed to pay over the cash balances of the ferm of each county—the main source of the king's income—to certain Jews. But this ceases suddenly, owing, as I imagine, to the discovery that Strongbow's mission to Ireland had been financed by the Jews. The king found that Jewish money could be utilised by others for purposes which were not exactly in his own interest.

The king was thus, as we have said, the sleeping-partner in all Jewish usury, and may be regarded as the Arch-usurer of the kingdom. By this means he was enabled to bring pressure on any of his barons who were indebted to the Jews. He could offer to release them of their debt or of the usury accruing on it, and in the case of debts falling into his hand by the death of a Jew, he could commute the debt for a much smaller sum. Thus the Cistercian abbeys referred to above paid Richard I. 1,000 marks instead of the 6,400 which they had owed to Aaron of Lincoln¹. And

¹ It was doubtless owing to this insecurity that such high interest was paid. The debtor, as I have said above, was practically betting against the life of the Jew. If he died before payment was exacted, he might get off for a much smaller sum.

as the king pressed the barons, so these passed on the pressure to their inferior vassals, from whom they demanded grants in aid to free themselves of Jewish indebtedness. It was only in this way that the lower tenantry were affected by Jewish usury, since they conducted their own business mainly by barter, and had no reason to resort to the Jews.

Thus, owing to the attitude of the Church towards the Jews and towards capitalism, the king was made the Arch-usurer of his realm. It must, however, be emphasised, as the point is new, that the king, as king, did not enter into any special relation with his Jews *quâ* Jews. He treated Christian and Jewish usurers alike, and claimed their money at their decease with remarkable impartiality (*Dial. de Scacc.*, lib. II. c.x.). The State knew of no disability of Jews for any position (apart from the initiatory ceremonies involving Christian oaths).² I have even come across evidence of Jews paying knights' fees. This anomalous relation of the king to his Jewish subjects led to some conflict of interest. Thus, as a good Christian he would naturally desire to see them converted, but as king he would lose their services as informal tax-gathers. He therefore claimed as compensation the goods and chattels of a Jew who became converted, and we find the Church complaining of the disabilities thus placed on the convert; nor was she oblivious of the king's sinful participation in Jewish usury.

Yet it was the Church that was ultimately to blame for the state of things which the Church blamed. The whole story is made sordid by the persistent way in which the Church closed every career to the Jew except usury. We may well regret both that Angevin England saw no other means of giving its Jews employment except as thumb-

¹ Curiously enough the whole Parliamentary struggle for the emancipation of the Jews raged round the form of the oath to be taken by Jewish M.P.'s.

screws of the Royal Treasury, and that the Jews had not the manhood to refuse to accept a livelihood, however lucrative, which was only possible by the oppression of their fellow-citizens.

ASSIZE OF JEWRY.—The materials for the history of the English Jews in the twelfth century are so much more extensive than that which is extant for any other European country, that it is possible to draw up an Assize of Jewry, a whole code of laws derived from the canons, charters, or rolls.¹ I have thought it worth while to draw up such a code with continuous enumeration, and descriptive cross-headings to the various sections. As a rule I have arranged the extracts in chronological order.

CHURCH ORDINANCES.

(1.) A Christian must not sell a Christian slave to a Jew (Theodosius, *Lib. Pæn.* xlii. 3).

(2.) Christians must not accept unleavened bread from them (*id.*, xlii. 1).

(3.) Mass must not be celebrated where Jews have been buried (*id.*, xlvii. 1).

(4.) Public offices should not be committed to Jews (Gratian, *Decr.* I, liv. 14).

(5.) Christian slaves in possession of Jews must be liberated (*id.*, 13).

(6.) Jews must not be converted by force, nor must converted Jews be allowed to revert (*id.*, I. xlv 5).

(7.) Jews cannot accuse Christians (*Corp. Jur. Can.*, ed. Friedburg, col. 489).

(8.) Jews about to be converted must be catechumens for eight months (*id.*, col. 1,392).

(9.) If a converted Jew reverts to Judaism, his children and slaves are not to be allowed to accompany him (*id.*, col. 1,392).

(10.) Christians taking up the cross are freed from usury to Jews (Pope Eugenius, ap. *Baroni Annales*, s.a. 1,145).

(11.) Clergy and Jews are not to be placed under secular juris-

¹ Numbers refer to the items from the Pipe Rolls, which I published in the *Archæological Review*, February, 1889. The pages referred to are those of my forthcoming *Jews of England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*.

diction (Decree of Council of Avranches, 1172 ; ap. Benedict, ed. Stubbs, i. 34).

(12.) Jews must not have Christians as servants (Mansi, *Concilia*, xx. 399) or as nurses (Gratian, *Decret.* V., vi. 13).

(13.) Testimony of Jews is not to be preferred to that of Christians (Benedict, Abbot, i. 230).

(14.) Jews may possess Christian churls, but not slaves (*Decr.* V., vi. 2).

(15.) They may restore old synagogues, but not build new ones (*id.*, 3-7).

(16.) On Good Friday they must keep doors and windows shut (*id.* 4).

(17.) Princes who spoil baptised Jews of their goods are to be excommunicated (*id.* 5, cf. No. 35).

(18.) Jew striking priest should be punished by secular power (*id.* 14).

(19.) They must not be condemned without judgment, nor disturbed at their festivals, nor are their cemeteries to be molested, nor their bodies exhumed (*id.* 9).

MAGNA CARTA JUDÆORUM.

[This seems to have been first granted in the reign of Henry I. ; we have confirmations, 1 Ric. I. (Rymer, *Fœdera*, i. 51, *M.C.R.*), and 2 Jo. (*Rotuli Cartarum*, Rec. Com. i. 93, *M.C.J.*). They agree except with regard to § vi.]

(20.) Jews have free residence in England and Normandy, and may hold lands, fiefs, pledges, gifts, and purchases (*M.C.R.*, § i. ; *M.C.J.*, § i.).

(21.) In a trial between Christian and Jew, each shall have two witnesses—one Jew, one Christian ; a writ shall serve the Jew instead of a witness (*M.C.R.*, § ii. ; *M.C.J.*, § ii.).

(22.) A Christian suing a Jew must appear before the "peers of the Jew" (*M.C.R.*, § ii. ; *M.C.J.*, § ii.).

(23.) A Jew's son shall succeed to his father's debts and money, but shall do right for same (*M.C.R.*, § iii. ; *M.C.J.*, § iii.).

(24.) Jews may receive and buy anything except church vestments or bloodstained garments (*M.C.R.*, § iii. ; *M.C.J.*, § iii.).

(25.) They are quits of appeal on oath *more judaico* (*M.C.R.*, § iv. ; *M.C.J.*, § iv.).

(26.) In debt cases Jew proves capital ; Christian, the interest (*M.C.R.*, § iv. ; *M.C.J.*, § iv.).

(27.) They can sell pledges after a year and a day¹ (*M.C.R.*, § v. ; *M.C.J.*, § v.).

(28.) They can only be called upon to plead before King's justices or wardens of king's castles (*M.C.R.*, § v. ; *M.C.J.*, § v.).

(29.) During the minority of the heir of a debtor, a Jew is not to be disturbed of his debt (*M.C.R.*, § vi.).

(30.) They may go with their chattels just as if they were the King's property (*M.C.R.*, § vi. ; *M.C.J.*, § vi.).

(31.) They are free of all Customs and Tolls (*M.C.R.*, § vii. ; *M.C.J.*, § vii.).

(32.) Criminal cases between Jews, except for the greater felonies, as homicide, mayhem, etc., may be decided among themselves by their own law (Confirmation by John, *l.c.*, probably first given by Henry II.; cf. Robertson, *Mat. Hist. of Thom. Becket*, iv. 148).

THE KING AND THE JEWS.

(33.) Jews [query, of different towns] have to get king's license to marry (Pipe Roll, items 15, 33, 58, 182), or not to marry in the case of a Jewess (10), or to give bill of divorce (38).

(34.) King is the guardian of orphans (25, 40).

(35.) Property of converted Jews reverts to king on baptism (Benedict, i. 230 ; cf. *supra*, No. 17).

(36.) "Jews and all theirs belong to the king" (*Laws of Edw. Confessor*, XXV.²).

(37.) Debts of a deceased Jew fall into the king's hands (70, 95, 101, 116, 170).

(38.) King claims one-fourth of Jews' chattels when tallaging the rest of England one-tenth for the Saladin Crusade (71, 82. Cf. Gervase of Canterbury, I. 422).

(39.) Christian debtors to Jews may become sureties for the latter's debts to the king (111).

(40.) King claims half of dowry settled on a Jewess (118).

(41.) One Jew may pay king for debts of another Jew to the king (144).

(42.) A Christian's land in the king's hand for a debt to a Jew

¹ Query, Is this the origin of the present custom with pawnbrokers' pledges?

² This is recognised to be an interpolation *temp.* Hen. II., and is inconsistent with the statement *supra* § 30 ; 'just as if' implies that they were *not* the king's property.

deceased is released when the rent reaches the amount of the pledge (164; because king cannot claim usury).

(43.) The king could quitclaim a subject of a debt to Jews (186, and pp. 205, 209, 229, 230, 231, 237, 238).

(44.) Jew's property may be distrained for debt not paid to the king (p. 222).

(45.) King may grant Jew's land, held on mortgage, to a Christian other than the original debtor, if he pays the same rent as latter till the said debtor pays off the debt and thereby comes into possession of his own land again (p. 230).

(46.) Usury to Jew lapses while debtor is on the king's service (p. 238).

(47.) King has a right to one besant (2s.) for every pound claimed by a Jew through his courts (the Royal Ten per Cent., pp. 239-41).

(48.) King has right to compensation for partnership between Jews (22, 83).

PRIVILEGES AND DISABILITIES.

(49.) Jews could only be buried in London up to 1177, afterwards wherever they dwelt (*Benedict*, i. 182).

(50.) Jews may not take arms or armour in pledge (*Assize of Arms*, 1181).

(51.) Jews hold land by rent in lieu of service (p. 94).

(52.) Jews could pay knights' fees (*Liber Rubens*).

(53.) Jews could not be "men" of an abbey (*Joce de Brakebond*, 33).

(54.) Burgesses must make hue and cry for a slain Jew (115).

(55.) Burgesses must pay fine for assaults on Jews (98, 102, 113, 117, 142), and must give hostages for same (138).

(56.) Jews could hold land or quit-rent granted by Chapter of St. Paul's (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* ix. 14, 22, 50, 68).

(57.) They could not sell tin unless stamped, nor keep tin of first smelting more than three months without its being re-smelted, nor remove it from Cornwall or Devon without license of the Warden of the Stannaries (*Liber Rubens*).

(58.) Jews could have seisin of a mortgage (27, 69, *Rot. Car. Reg.*).

(59.) There was an Archpresbyter of all the Jews of England, who was appointed for life, and could only be called upon to plead before the king or the chief justice, and should have safe conduct wherever he might go (*Rot. Cart.* i. 77).

(60.) Jews could sell manors (p. 204).

(61.) Jews had to have passports to pass from England to Normandy, and *vice versa*.

(62.) Jew could hold land at peppercorn rent (Brit. Mus. Add. MS., 4542).

LEGAL.

(63.) The "manbote" of a slain Jew was 20s. [as for a slave] (6).

(64.) Jews must not lend to men under king's displeasure (16), or on sacred vestments (17. *Cf. M.C.R.*, § iii. *supra*, No. 24).

(65.) Jews must not "cambire" [? mint or exchange money] without king's licence (41).

(66.) They must not sell chattels to other Jews without permit (44).

(67.) Jewish sureties take over property of bailee (67).

(68.) Jurnet, the Jew, is very heavily fined (6,000 marks) for marrying a Christian heiress (67).

(69.) An apostate Jew is liable to heavy punishment (p. 106).

(70.) A Jew must not buy treasure trove without consent of Justice (93).

(71.) Jews must not be in the society of outlaws (145).

(72.) Jews could settle pleas between themselves by duel (pp. 176, 233).

(73.) Disputed charters could be adjudicated by a jury of twelve Jews and twelve Christians (184 ; p. 201).

(74.) Trials for mayhem against a Jew could be held before the ordinary jury of a hundred (Tovey, *Ang. Jud.*, 66).

(75.) Clipped money found in the hands of Jews to be perforated, and the Jews put in custody (*Pat. Roll*).

(76.) Jews may use old depreciated money to buy food or clothing, but not to pay king or buy merchandise (Assize of Money, 1205).

(77.) A Jew can be convicted as a forger by the oath of another Jew (183).

(78.) A Jew who evades arrest may have his chattels seized, but on surrendering and finding bail recovers them (p. 232).

JEWS IN RELATION TO DEBTORS.

(79.) Jews must not keep back acquitted charters (62).

(80.) One Jew may pay another for a Christian (143).

(81.) Debtors not paying up could be distrained through king's court for capital and interest (181).

(82.) A Christian could make a Jew or Jewess his attorney to receive rents till his debt was paid off.

(83.) A Christian may take another Christian's lands for acquitting him of debt to Jews (188).

(84.) Charters were returned to Jews when debt was cleared off, or King quitclaimed the debtor (p. 222).

"THE ORDINANCES OF THE JEWRY," 1194.

[Regulating the registration of Jewish debts, and paving the way for the Exchequer of the Jews of the thirteenth century.—R. Howden, ed. Stubbs, iii. 266.]

(85.) All debts, pledges, mortgages, lands, houses, rents and possessions shall be registered.

(86.) Any Jew concealing aught of his possessions shall be imprisoned and lose all.

(87.) All contracts between Jews and Christians shall be made in six or seven places, and before six officials, of whom two shall be lawyers that are Jews.

(88.) All charters are to be made in duplicate, and one copy to be kept by the Jew.

(89.) The other copy is to be kept in a common chest locked with three keys, and sealed with three seals (one key and one seal being kept by the two Jews.)

(90.) A roll shall be kept of transcripts of all charters.

(91.) There shall be two scribes and one keeper of the roll, each to receive one penny for each deed.

(92.) No contracts shall be valid except before a quorum of the six, and there shall be three transcripts of all payments to Jews, one to be kept by the Jew, one by the scribes, and one by the keeper of the roll.

(93.) Every Jew shall swear not to conceal aught.

(94.) Two Proctors shall be appointed to decide cases between Jew and Christian (addition of John of Brompton. Otherwise called Bailiffs, Wardens, Justiciars of the Jews.)

JEWISH REGULATIONS.

[Occurring in the scanty references to English Jews in the *Tosaphoth*, etc.]

(95.) Relatives must not judge among Jews in a case where a relative is concerned (*Sepher Hajashar*, 71a).

(96.) A Jew betrothed to one of three sisters not specified must divorce all three.

(97.) If a Gentile pays too much, and cannot be found, the extra money goes to the original lender, and not to any agent.

(98.) Seven elders decide on any disputed questions (p. 49).

(99.) Informers, and those using Gentile courts against fellow-Jews, are excommunicated (p. 49).

(100.) Milk drawn by a Gentile is unclean ¹ (Mord. Ab. Sar. ii. 826).

(101.) Barnacle geese may be eaten by Jews¹ (Meir of Rothenburg Resp. No. 160).

(102.) Fires may be kept alight by Gentiles for Jews on Sabbath (p. 111).

(103.) Unclean meal does not defile if only one-sixtieth of the whole parcel bought ¹ (p. 146).

(104.) Jews must not eat what a Gentile has boiled ¹ (p. 178).

(105.) English Jews may use *Kannabos* (? hemp) on their woollen garments (*Shibole Halleket* MS.).

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.—From incidental notices and remarks of the chroniclers and even in the rolls we can gather some information, scanty enough it is true, as to the *Culturgeschichte* of the English Jews in the twelfth century. And first with regard to their relations to their fellow-citizens. Up to the *émeutes* of 1189-90 these were exceptionally friendly. The dispute between R. Simeon Chasid and Abbot Crispin is of a most amicable description. "He used often to come to me as a friend both on business and to see me," the genial Abbot writes (S. Anselm *Opera*, ii. 255). Moses of Wallingford was highly respected at Oxford (*Acta Sanct.*, October 19th, St. Frideswide). At Lynn, during the riots, one of the victims "was a distinguished physician friendly with and honoured by the Christians," as William of Newbury puts it (i. 310). And the chroniclers seem anxious in their accounts to attribute the riots to the ill-will of foreigners so far as they can.

With the clergy we find equally good relations. The Jews entered churches freely, even to seek their debtors, and took refuge in the Abbey of St. Edmonds in times of

¹ It is curious and characteristic that most of the Anglo-Jewish enactments relate to the customary dietary laws.

commotion. The monks of Canterbury had the sympathy and succour of the Jews, who "prayed for the continuance of the convent in their synagogues" when the archbishop had put them under excommunication. "A wonderful contrast indeed!" says Gervase of Canterbury (i. 405). They mourned the death of the good bishop Hugh of Lincoln as much as any of their fellow citizens (*Vita*, ed. Dymock, p. 373). There is an interesting account of a witty Jew travelling to Shrewsbury with Archdeacon Peche and Deacon Dayville and making puns on a country whose archdeacon is sin (Peche) and dean the devil (Gerald Cambr., *Opera*, vi. 146). This shows that the ordinary talk of the Jews was French, as is also clear from the glosses in the English Tosaphists and from the fact that Richard of Devises makes a French Jew recommend a lad not to go northward in England, because he will find none speaking Romance (ed. Howlett, p. 438). This implies that they only came in contact with the upper classes, and indeed, as we have seen, their business was only with them.

On the other hand the Jews did not scruple to express their views freely about the prevailing religion. One of them openly ridiculed at Oxford the miracles attributed to St. Frideswide. R. Simeon Chasid complains of the worship of images and pictures of the crucified God. "They swelled insolently against Christ," says the chronicler in explaining their persecutions. Peter of Blois complains of the pertinacity with which the Jews disputed about the faith: they laid stress upon the literal interpretation of Scripture. On one occasion a fine was paid for knocking off a priest's cap (72), presumably during service or in church. It is obvious that they used their powers of ridicule against Christianity, and helped thereby to increase the feeling of animosity against them.

In another way they acted unwisely and inconsiderately. Their ostentation in the display of their riches struck the chroniclers when explaining the causes of the riots. The late Professor Freeman was never tired of quoting Aaron

of Lincoln's boast that it was he who had really built the Abbey of St. Alban's. They were the first to build stone houses, partly for protection no doubt, but it was the great sign of luxury. The houses of Joce and Benedict, the leading Jews at York, were like royal palaces, and William of Newbury refers to those in London in similar terms. All this could not have failed to irritate the minor nobles who saw themselves growing poorer and poorer every day and the Jews richer and richer. They wore weapons and used them freely. The riot at Lynn began with their pursuing a converted Jew into a church with drawn weapons. Two cases are on record of trial by duel, one of them between two Jews, while a Jew is mentioned named Benedictus Miles, *i.e.*, the Knight.

Conversions to Christianity do not seem to be at all frequent. Out of a list of some 750, only six converts occur, one of them that of a Jewess. During the massacres of 1189-90, there were doubtless many forcible baptisms, but Richard I. wisely laid no stress on such cases, and allowed Benedict of York, christened William during the London *émeute*, to return to his own religion without suffering the penalties attaching to such apostasy. On the other hand, there is on record the conversion of two Cistercian monks to Judaism, whereupon the witty Walter Mapes remarked that he wondered they had not been converted to Christianity. Ephraim of Bonn declares that a whole congregation of twenty-two proselytes was put to death during the outburst of Easter, 1190.

As before explained, their occupation was almost exclusively that of money-lending. A couple of physicians are however mentioned, the one at Lynn, and Isaac Medicus, of London. They dealt also in jewels and precious stones; a carbuncle of Mossey, the rich Jew of Gloucester, is mentioned as the subject of litigation, and King John had a jewel that had belonged to Simon the Jew; his goldsmith was Leo the Jew. There is a coin of Henry II. with the

name of the moneyer Isac, of Everwic (York), but it is doubtful whether he was a Jew. A Jew is mentioned as keeping an inn (Robertson, *Materials*, ii. 7), and various scribes occur, as well as a master of the boys (*magister puerorum*). The scribes were probably *sopherim* or calligraphers, as Zunz mentions that Machsorim from England were brought over to France in the twelfth century (*Die Ritus*), and Ephraim of Bonn reports that many beautiful books were seized at York and sold in Cologne after the massacre of 1190. Libraries were formed; in two cases large sums were paid to retain the books of a deceased parent (Pipe Roll 119, Sir Morell's), or to recover those of the person fined (216).

As regards their customs among themselves we have but little knowledge. They used to betroth their daughters while still minors, excusing the practice on account of the frequent persecutions, which made it doubtful when they could pay the dowry (*Tos. Kidd.* 41a). The few religious problems discussed by them related mainly to the dietary laws (See Assize *supra*, Nos. 100—104). They did not smell sweet savours at the end of the Sabbath when a festival followed (*Hamanhig*, 83b). They adjudicated on partnerships and agreements among themselves (86), and a chapter of Jews were once called upon to decide the question whether a Jew could take usury from a Jew (128). On another occasion a daughter applied to have an inquest whether her father had died a Christian (161). The lower minds among the Jews excused themselves for taking usury from the Christians, against Deut. xxiii. 20, because the Edomites are called strangers (Obad. ver. 11. *Rev. Et. Juives*, iv. 8).

The Jews do not seem to have rendered themselves liable to the criminal law to any great extent. The worst charges recorded are one of rape (189), one of forcible entry (126; the accused was replevied, or admitted to bail), for clipping the coin (p. 233; the accuser was also a Jew), for mayhem ("ementulation" Tovey 66; the accused was acquitted). The

chief charges are rather connected with their business; keeping back acquitted charters (62); being a party to an illegal contract (44); giving false witness (48, 113, 133 *ter*); buying treasure trove (93); concealing charters after death of father (123, 146); suborning evidence (189*a*). These, with a charge of waste and purpresture (30, encroachment), and of having ‘cambired’—whatever that may mean—(41, probably minted without license) are all the charges ever mentioned in the records, and, on the whole, form a tolerably clean bill of moral health. It is noteworthy in the case of mayhem or mutilation, the Jew was acquitted by the ordinary jury of the hundred before whom he was tried; I fancy it was a case of circumcision of a convert.

We may conclude this section with a few items dealing rather with folk-lore. The myth of the blood accusation must have helped to make the Jews appear uncanny in the minds of the people, and the (French) ballad of the Jew-boy who was murdered by his father for being converted, and sang hymns to the Virgin after death, occurs in many English MSS. Both Matthew Paris and Ephraim of Bonn agree in stating that the Jews were kept away from the coronation of Richard I., lest they should cast some magic spell on the ceremony. The Jews of England believed in the curious myth of the barnacle geese which grow on trees. They applied to Rabbi Tam to know if they might eat them, and he replied that they should be slaughtered after Jewish fashion, and were then edible by pious Jews. We do not hear of Jewesses exercising their supposed function of witches and enchantresses. On the contrary, we hear of a Christian woman who was accustomed to charm the foot of a Jewish woman, and was only taught by a miracle of St. Thomas Becket how wicked her conduct was, not, as it would seem, in using spells, but rather for exercising them for the benefit of a Jewess.

EDUCATION.—The remarkable code of Jewish education given at the end of Dr. Güdemann’s *Culturgeschichte*, Bnd. I., was drawn up, I am strongly of opinion, in England; at

least, as regards the first of the three sections of which it is composed. The seventh clause of this speaks of the French Jews as foreigners, and the eleventh refers to the long winter nights, while the whole basis of the scheme is the contrast between the small schools of the provinces and the great school for the separated in the capital; this would only apply to England, if France is to be left out, as is implied by Clause 7. Besides, I have found the provisions of the code exactly followed in England. Blomfield, *Norfolk*, iv. 225, declares that the school was at the south end of the synagogue at Norwich; here we have the small school of the provinces. And there is a record of the *Magna schola Judæorum* of London, belonging to Abraham fil Rabi, in Ironmonger Lane (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 4,542); there we have the great school of the capital. Also R. Yomtob of Joigny, who was martyred at York, mentions that his father was one of the *Perushim*, or Separated. The general education of the Jews of the time is shown by their literary activity, the visit of Abraham ibn Ezra in 1158, and the fact that even Jewesses were able to draw up deeds in Hebrew (Harl. ch. 43, A. 54). Altogether there is sufficient probability for my contention for me to include a translation of the code in my forthcoming book, and the following summary of it here. The letters and figures following in brackets refer to the sections of the three different codes included in the document. I have attempted to unify them.

JEWISH CODE OF EDUCATION.

(i.) Every first-born male is to be set apart (separated) for the study of the law from the eighth day after circumcision (A 1, B 5).

(ii.) At five years old every Jewish boy is to be brought in the month Nisan to the small school of the provinces, and taught to read; then put to Leviticus, then to read the weekly portion in Hebrew, then in the vernacular, and then in the Targum (A 7, 8; B 6, C 1).

(iii.) At ten years he studies the Mishna, beginning with the tractate *Beracoth* of the Talmud, and going through the smaller tractates of the order *Moed* in the next three years (B 6, C 2).

(iv.) At thirteen years the education of the ordinary boy finishes ; that of the separated continues in the same school till the lad is sixteen, when he decides for himself whether he will devote his life to the law, and, if so, goes up to the great school of the separated in the capital for another seven years (A 2, 3 ; C 3).

(v.) The small school of the provinces is to be held in a two-storied house, capable of holding 100 scholars, ten teachers, and one rector to supervise. No teaching is to be done at home, and the rector must not reside at the school with his family, but go home every Sabbath (B 6, A 5, B 3).

(vi.) The rector gives two lectures, one in the morning, one in the afternoon. The teachers go over each lesson twice with their class.¹ At the end of each week there is repetition of the week's work ; so at the end of the month, and at the end of the summer and the winter session. No teacher must take more than ten pupils, nor have any other calling but teaching (B 7, A 10, 6, 12).

(vii.) The lads are encouraged to examine one another every evening in the day's lessons. Dull scholars are to be sent away, so as not to keep back the more forward. Teaching is to be by book, not by heart. In winter the evening lessons are to be short, on account of the light (A 9, 5, 7, 11).

(viii.) Every member of the community pays twopence yearly as school-fees, instead of the half-shekel of old. The great school is to be bought, and then let out to the separated. The separated pay for their lodging, and a share of the teachers' salaries. The rector gets 20 marks yearly, a teacher 8 (A 4, B 1, 6).

NAMES.—From the abundant materials at my disposal I have drawn up a list of some 750 names of English Jews and Jewesses of the twelfth century, in most cases with their towns of residence. Such a long list contains much information, apart from the names themselves. But these have their points of interest and instruction in themselves. As with most early mediæval names—Jewish or Gentile—they are mainly “Christian,” or first names, with an explanatory addition, derived from birthplace, office, or personal peculiarity. The favourite ones were Scriptural, as may be clearly shown by the following list of the most frequent :—Isaac (59) ; Josce, *i.e.*, Joseph (55) ; Abraham

¹ This probably refers to the great school of the capital.

(49); Benedict, or Bendit, the Latinised form of Berachyah (49); Jacob (40); Moses, Moss, or Mosse (38); Samuel (37); Vives, Vivard, Vivelot, various forms for the Hebrew *Chaim*, "Life" (23); Elias (19); Aaron (18); Deulacres, (Heb. *Gedaliah*) (17); Manesser (17); Samson (16); Solomon (15); besides Aser (Asher), Benjamin, David, Juda, Jeremias, Naemia, Simon. Other Biblical forms occur in somewhat strange disguise, as Deulesalt, *i.e.*, Dieu-le-sant, for Isaiah; Serfdeu for Obadiah; Dieudone, or Deodonatus for Elchanan; Hakelin, a diminutive for Isaac; Kersun, probably equivalent to Gershon, Cok and Coket, probably both diminutives of Isaac in its Hebrew form. The women's names are less distinctively Biblical, Anna or Henna; Avigay (Abigail); Biket (diminutive of Rebecca); Cipora (Zippora); Ester; Lia (Leah), Miriam, and Sara, forming but a short list, contrasted with Alemantina, Alfield, Antera, Belia (Belle), Beleasez, Chere, Clarice, Comitissa, Deucosa, Dona, Drua, Duzelina, Fleur de Liz, Fluria or Floria, Gentil, Joie, Juette, Margaret, Maria, Mirabilla, Muriel, Precieuse, Pulcelle, Rana (Reine), Regina, Riche, Slema. These names of Jewesses indicate the main source whence the list of Anglo-Jewish names was derived, Anglo-Norman French. Thus, among the men we find such first names as Amiot, Bonefei (Bonfoi), Bonevie, Bon-enfaund (*bon enfant*), Hospitard, Justelin, Morel, Peitivin, Piers, Seignuret (dim. of *seigneur*), Ursel, Yvo, and Yvelin, not to mention the French translations of Hebrew names, like Deulebenie, Dieulacresse, Deusaie, Serfdeu, etc. English is indeed conspicuous by its absence in the list, except for Alfield, among the ladies, and Jurnet (Jornet), among the men, if the latter be, as has been suggested, derived from "jornet," a jerkin or jacket, and so an appropriate *Kinnui* (vernacular form) of Jacob. Peter occurs in several cases, but this may be due to the Latin as well as to the English. One name is from the Greek, Kanonimos, evidently a mistake for Kalonymos (Hebrew, *Shemtob*), but this was probably derived from Germany, where it

was introduced by the well-known family of that name from Magna Græcia. Three of the first-names imply foreign origin, Flaming, Lumbard, Peitevin (Poitou). I may conclude what I have to say on the "Christian" names of the English Jews by drawing up a list of those about which I know not what to say for their peculiarity, Benleveng, Calamod, Cassi, Chermin, Eligai, Eudon, Hanechin, Janem, Jagunce, Mahy, Makar, Marteri, Melin, Meus, Pipili, Potelin, Santo. Brun is almost the only descriptive first name, though one would have thought most Jews of that date were "brun."

More information is to be gained or conjectured from the surnames. The majority of these, indeed, give rather the place of domicile of their bearers; Abraham de Bungay, Dieulacresse de Wallingford, and so on. Some, again, are merely distinguishing epithets, as Isaac Senex of Cambridge, as distinguished from Isaac Juvenis of the same town. Other descriptive titles read strangely in their Latin forms: Mosse cum Naso (probably "Nosey Moses"), Deudone cum pedibus tortis (? "Bandy Deudone"), Manasser Grassus ("Fat Manasser," cf. "Isaac le Gros"), Benedict Lengus ("Long Benedict"). Some surnames refer to office; several have the title Bishop, two that of Presbyter, the exact meaning of which will concern us later. One, Isaac of London, is called Medicus, two at Bristol are called Furmager, probably a corruption of "fermager," or ferm agent, a collector of taxes. Hebrew officials are also in evidence; there is an Abraham and a Benedict Pernas (Warden) of Lincoln, an Abraham Gabbai (Treasurer of Congregations) at Bristol. Two men have the addition of Puncteur, or Pointur, which I identify with Nakdan. One of these I identify with Berachyah Nakdan, the other with Samuel Nakdan, the author of an important grammatical treatise now at Berlin. Several Scriptoris occur, probably *Sopherim*. There still remain several true surnames; Barlibrod, Carini, Blund, Bressus, Crespin, Curj, Gaudi, Kiterel, Levi, Malmerri, Merdenhostel, Multrun, Quatre-

buches, of which Barlibrod and Kiterel, and perhaps some of the others, are English.

THE JEWISH BISHOPS.—There are ten persons in the list who have the curious title of Bishop, four in London (Deodatus, 1168-78, Abraham, Deulesalt, Vives, 1194), three in Lincoln (Josce, Samson and Judas), one at Exeter (Deulecresse), one at Nottingham (Samuel), one at Bristol (Isaac), and one at Winchester (Solomon), and to these we may add a Samuel le Prester at Norwich, and Jacob, Presbyter of London and of all England. What exactly were these Bishops and Priests of the Jews? The clue, I think, is given by the fact that there are three of them in the two most important centres of the English Jewry, London and Lincoln.¹ We know from John's Confirmation of the Jewish Charters (*supra* Assize, § 32), that the English Jews had right to jurisdiction among themselves, a right which was granted them, I conjecture, by Henry II. (Robertson, *Mat. Thom. Becket*, iv. 148). On one occasion it is mentioned that a question whether a Jew might take usury from a Jew, was to be decided by a chapter of the Jews (*capitulum Judæorum*.) Such jurisdiction would be administered by the three *Dayanim* or judges, who, even to this day are the ecclesiastical assessors in all Jewish courts. It is only natural to connect the three *Episcopi* with the three *Dayanim* and interpret *Episcopus* as ecclesiastical supervisor. These were the "peers of the Jews," before whom trials were held (*supra* Assize § 22.) I can guess whence the title came. There was clearly intimate relation between the English Jews of the early twelfth century and the Jews of the Rhine Provinces. There we find the title "*Episcopus Judæorum*," especially at Cologne (Honiger, *Judenschreins-Buch* (1888), Nos. 83, 232, 234, and *pass*). There, however, it was used mostly to express the *Parnas*, or president of the congregation, and only one *Episcopus* occurs at the time. Now

¹ There were only three at London 1220, 1227 and at Lincoln in 1240. See my "London Jewry" in *Papers Anglo-Jewish Exhibition*, p. 48.

in England we find three simultaneous *Episcopi*, who could not all be wardens, while both at Bristol and Lincoln we find Jews with the title *Pernaz*, or warden, who were not "*Episcopi*." The constitution of the congregation seems to have been a warden (*Pernaz*); a treasurer (*Gabbai*)—these for synagogue and financial matters; three *Dayanim*, for ecclesiastical jurisdiction, forming a chapter of the Jews (*capitulum Judæorum*); a rector of the High School, with teachers under him (*magister puerorum*); and scribes (*Scrip-tores*) or cyrographers, for writing deeds; while the "*Ordinances of the Jewry*" mention two "*lawyers that are Jews*," to supervise contracts between Jews and Christians. The presbyter, or prestre, would then be the *Ab-beth-din*, or head of the assembly.

That the title, "*Bishop*," was familiar among the ordinary Englishmen of the time, is shown as early as 1168, when a bishop of the Jews entered St. Paul's, while some bishops of the Christians were deciding ecclesiastical cases. "*Receive also this bishop among you*," called out a wit among the crowd; "*he alone of all the bishops has not betrayed the archbishop*," *i.e.*, Thomas Becket (*Robertson Materials*).

To sum up. The title "*Bishop*" comes from Germany, where it meant "*warden*," and was applied in England, about 1164, to represent the three *Dayanim*, who had the right by English law to adjudicate on cases between Jews.

ANGLO-JEWISH LITERATURE IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.
—The English Jewry was the child of the French Jewry, and followed it at first in its literary pursuits. Yet after a time an independent school, I conjecture, arose in England, which towards the end of the twelfth century eclipsed all the schools of North Europe in importance. This supremacy was due, in my opinion, to the predominant position taken by England at the head of the Angevin Empire, which included all the West of France, as well as to the expulsion of the Jews from France between the

years 1182 and 1198. With the loss of Normandy in 1206, this hegemony of the English Jewry ceased. In making this assertion I am relying on several identifications I have made of Rabbis mentioned in the *Tosaphoth*, etc., with those named in the English records. Much depends here on the answer to a question which I have discussed elsewhere ("Was Sir Leon ever in London?" *Jew. Chron.*, Jan. 25th, 1889), but I have seen no cause to doubt the cogency of the reasons which led me to find an English domicile for Abraham ben Joseph, Elchanan ben Isaac, Joseph Bechor Shor, and Sir Leon of Paris. Still less have I seen reason to doubt my identification of Berachyah Nakdan with Benedict le Puncteur of Oxford, especially after Dr. Neubauer's discovery of references to England in the original preface of the *Mishle Shualim*.

I may draw up the following list of Jews writing in England in the twelfth century, placing after their names the record names of those whom I have identified with the various writers:—

- (1.) Aaron of Canterbury (*Minhat Jehuda*, Deut. xxvi. 2), exegete.
- (2.) Abraham ben Jehuda (Abraham fil Jude de Parisiis), a Tosaphist (Zunz, *Zur Gesch.*, 48).
- (3.) Abraham ben Joseph of Orleans (Abraham fil Rabi Joce), a Tosaphist, and father-in-law of Sir Leon (12).
- (4.) Abraham ibn Ezra wrote his *Yesod Moreh* and *Sabbath Epistle* while in England in 1158.
- (5.) Benjamin of Canterbury (Magister Benjamin of Cambridge), author of some glosses on Joseph Kimchi's *Sepher Hagaluy* (ed. Matthews *pass*).
- (6.) Berachyah Nakdan (Benedict le Puncteur de Oxon), author of *Mishle Shualim* (a book of fables), a treatise on mineralogy, a translation of Adelard of Bath's *Questiones Naturales*, and a commentary on Job, nephew of R. Benjamin (5). One of the most important figures in mediæval Jewish literature.
- (7.) Chaim of Paris (Vives de Paris), a Tosaphist mentioned in Mordecai *Baba Kama* viii. 87, according to Kohn, *Mord.* 104.
- (8.) Elchanan ben Isaac (Deodatus Episcopus Judæorum), son-in-law of Sir Morell of England, and teacher of Sir Leon of Paris,

author of *Sad ha-Ibbur*, an astronomical work (*Minhat Jehuda*, Gen. xxi. 2), and of liturgical poetry (Zunz, *Syn. Poesie*, 249).

(9.) Elia the martyred of York, Tosaphist, pupil of Sir Morell (Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, 49).

(10.) Isaac ben Yomtob of Joigny (Ysaac de Juueignj) Tosaphist (Zunz, *l. c.* 52 ; *Litges.* 286).

(11.) Jacob of Orleans, Tosaphist, exegete, murdered at London, 1189 (Ephraim of Bonn, *Martyrology*).

(12.) Jehuda ben Isaac of Paris "Sir Leon" (Leo le Blund) pupil of Elchanan (8), son-in-law of Abraham (3), the most distinguished Tosaphist between R. Tam and R. Meir of Rothenburg ; he was trained in England, according to my hypothesis, 1182-98, when Jews were excluded from France.

(13.) Joseph ben Isaac (Josce fil Ysaac), a Tosaphist.

(14.) Joseph ben Jacob of Morel, for whom Abraham ibn Ezra (4) wrote his *Yesod Moreh*.

(15.) Joseph of Orleans (Rubigotsce, 31 Henry I., 1130) an important exegete and Tosaphist, also known as Joseph Bechor Shor. His commentary on the Pentateuch, was partly published by Jellinek. He was father of Abraham ben Joseph (3). He seems to have left England in Stephen's reign, and settled at Rouen (*Rot. Cart.*, 105b).

(16.) Menachem of London, also known as Elia Menachem, quoted by R. Moses ben Isaac (17) as having written a book with an anagrammatic title like his own, probably an exegetical work (Cf. Halberstamm, *Catalog*, p. 66).

(17.) Moses ben Isaac, author of *Leshon Lemudim* (in his youth) and the *Sepher Shoham*, both grammatical works. Part of the latter has been edited by Mr. Collins.

(18.) Moses ben Jacob (Mosse fil Jacob) referred to bringing a question before R. Menachem (16) *Hagahoth Ascheri*, Sanh. c. 5.

(19.) Moses ben Yomtob, Nakdan author of the *Darke Nikud* or Massoretic rules attached to most of the Rabbinic Bibles, and published separately by Friendsdorf. The attribution to Moses ben Yomtob rather than to Moses ben Isaac, I deduce from the colophon of the Berlin Codex. Besides Moses ben Isaac quotes Moses ben Yomtob as his master (ed. Collins, p. 37).

(20.) Samuel Nakdan (Samuel le Pointur de Bristowe), author of an important grammatical treatise in MS. at Berlin (Steinsch. *Cat.*, p. 100). He is quoted by Moses ben Isaac (16), and Benjamin of Cambridge (5) in his glosses.

(21.) Samuel ben Solomon, "Sir Morell of England" (Morell, Norwich), father-in-law of Elchanan (8) (Zunz, *Litges.*, 273), and teacher of Elia of York (Zunz, *Zur Gesch.*, 49), an important Tosaphist.

(22.) Samuel ben Elchanan (Samuel fil Deudone), a Tosaphist Zunz, *l.c.* 55).

(23.) Yomtob ben Isaac of Joigny, the inspirer of the heroic episode at York (Ephraim of Bonn, *Martyrology*), an important Tosaphist, and author of a hymn still recited on the Day of Atonement, with the refrain סלחתי.

(24.) Yomtob ben Moses of Bristol, author of a legal work, *Sepher Tana'im* (supra JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III., 778).

Some of these¹ were merely visitors (4, 10, 11), others of no particular importance (1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 22). But a dozen remain who would do credit to any period of Jewish literature. In particular the school of Massorites and Grammarians, formed by Benjamin of Cambridge, Moses ben Isaac, Moses ben Yomtob, and Samuel Nakdan, form quite a rival school to that of the Kimchi's, and Benjamin's glosses to Kimchi's *Sepher Galuy* show that the English grammarians could hold their own with the Provençals. Joseph Bechor Shor ("Rubigotsce" of the Pipe Roll, 31 Hen. I., *i.e.*, Rabbi Josce) only ranks second to Rashbam among the exegetes of his day, and Sir Leon of Paris ("Leo Blund" of the English records, 1186-98) was the most important Tosaphist of his day. Yomtob of York's artificial yet brilliant Atonement hymn is still the most familiar portion of the service of the day, while in the versatile productions of Berachyah Nakdan, or, as I would prefer to call him, Benedict le Puncteur, of Oxford, the English Jews of the twelfth century possessed a wit, an exegete, a translator, and Hebrew stylist, only equalled in the history of New Hebrew literature by the name of Alcharisi. My researches into Anglo-Jewish history would be amply rewarded if I have succeeded in reclaiming Berachyah Nakdan for his native land.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

¹ Before my researches only 4, 5, 9, 11, 23, were known to have been in England in the twelfth century.